



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,867	01/29/2004	Damon H. DeHart	ABB-126-A	4117
48980 7590 10/16/2008				
YOUNG & BASILE, P.C.				
3001 WEST BIG BEAVER ROAD				
SUITE 624				
TROY, MI 48084				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, TUAN VAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3731				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@youngbasile.com

audit@youngbasile.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/767,867

Applicant(s)

DEHART, DAMON H.

Examiner

TUAN V. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 63-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32-41, 54, 55, 59 and 60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 63-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In the Office action mailed out on May 13, 2008, claims 1-10, 32-41, 54-55, 59-60 and 63-67 are pending in this present application. Claims 32-41, 54, 55, 59 and 60 have been withdrawn and Claims 1-10 and 63-67 were examined and rejected.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after the final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 13, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments filed on August 13, 2008 that Ayres fails to disclose the second end of the lancet configured to penetrate the skin of a patient having a first and second sharpened tips have been fully considered and they are persuasive, therefore, the rejection is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-10 and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Humphrey (U.S. 5,607,401).**
6. Referring to claims 1-6 and 63-66, Humphrey discloses (Figs. 12 and 58) a hypodermic cylindrical needle 10 (Fig. 12) attached to a syringe (Fig. 58), that is capable to use as a lancet device, comprising: a seamless unitary member which is hollowed along at least a portion of its length wherein the needle including first and second ends wherein the first end further includes a first and second sharpened tips that are created by a pair of bevel faces or planar faces (col. 10, lines 48-54 and col. 12, lines 63-64). With respect to the limitation that the holder is configured to move the lancet to penetrate the skin of a patient, noting that the syringe and needle, is held and moved by a healthcare provider or a user to penetrate a patient skin, thus, Humphrey discloses the hypodermic needle is configured to move to penetrate the skin of a patient.
7. Referring to claim 3, the limitation of “first and second ground surfaces which at least partially define first and second sharpened tips” is product-by-process claims. Referring to claim 64, the limitation of “the first tip and the second tip are at least partially defined by first and second ground surfaces” is product-by-process

claims. Here it is noted that a comparison of the recited process with the prior art processes does NOT serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product. In re Fessman, 489 F2d 742, 180 U.S. P.Q. 324 (CCPA 1974). Whether a product is patentable depends on whether is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable. In re Klug, 333 F2d 905, 142 U.S.P.Q 161 (CCPA 1964). In an ex parte case, product-by-process claims are not construed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15, see footnote 3.

8. Referring to claims 7-10, Humphrey discloses (Fig. 12) the needle point includes a first ground surface and a second ground surface, wherein the first ground surface and second ground surface mirror one another about the horizontal plane and each ground surface extends approximately 180 degrees about the longitudinal axis (col. 10, lines 50-52). Figure 12 appears to show the single angle ground surface and each of the ground surface extends from the horizontal plane at an acute angle relative to the longitudinal axis.
9. Referring to claim 67, Humphrey discloses the needle for penetrating patient skin, thus, Humphrey inherently discloses the needle is rigid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
12. **Claims 1-10 and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayres (U.S. 3,906,932) in view of .**
13. Referring to claims 1-6 and 63-66, Ayres discloses (see Figs. 1-5 and 7) a cylindrical needle 10 and holder 22 (Fig. 5), that is capable to use as a lancet device, comprising: a seamless unitary member which is hollowed along at least a portion of its length wherein the needle including first and second ends wherein the first end further includes a first and second sharpened tips 16, 18 that are created by a pair of bevel faces 12 or planar faces and a Vacutainer tube 22 (Background of The Invention) or holder 22 (see col. 2, lines 18-65). With respect to the limitation that the holder is configured to move the lancet to penetrate the skin of a patient, noting that the Vacutainer tube 22 (Background of The Invention and Fig. 5), which also includes the needle, is held and moved by a healthcare

provider or a user to penetrate a patient skin to withdraw blood sample (Background of the invention), thus, the needle is moved by Vacutainer tube 22 or holder 22. Thus, Ayres inherently discloses the holder 22 is configured to move the needle or lancet to penetrate the skin of a patient. Ayres fails to explicitly disclose the both ends needle of the needle 40 having the same needle point design as shown in Figure 1. Noting that Ayres discloses the needle 40 is a double ended needle, one end for penetration of a septum of a Vacutainer and the opposite end for penetration of a blood vessel. However, Boothroyd discloses (Geoffrey Boothroyd, Peter Dewhurst, Winston Knight, Product Design for Manufacture and Assembly, 1994, Marcel Dekker, Inc., pages 64 and 165) that for ease of handling an assembly component during an assembly process the assembly components should be designed to have end-to-end symmetrical. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide both ends of the needle 40, as disclosed by Ayres, having the same needle point design as shown in Figure1 so that it too would have the same advantage.

14. Referring to claim 3, the limitation of "first and second ground surfaces which at least partially define first and second sharpened tips" is product-by-process claims. Referring to claim 64, the limitation of "the first tip and the second tip are at least partially defined by first and second ground surfaces" is product-by-process claims. Here it is noted that a comparison of the recited process with the prior art processes does NOT serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product. In re Fessman, 489 F2d 742, 180 U.S. P.Q. 324 (CCPA 1974). Whether a

product is patentable depends on whether is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable. In re Klug, 333 F2d 905, 142 U.S.P.Q 161 (CCPA 1964). In an ex parte case, product-by-process claims are not construed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15, see footnote 3.

15. Referring to claims 7-10, Ayres discloses (Fig. 7) the first ground surface 12 and second ground surface 14 is a single angle ground surface and each of the ground surface extends from the horizontal plane at an acute angle relative to the longitudinal axis. Figures 3 and 7 show the first and second ground surfaces 12, 14 mirror one another about the horizontal plane and each ground surface extends approximately 180 degrees about the longitudinal axis.
16. Referring to claim 67, Ayres discloses the needle for penetrating rubber stopper of the holder 22 (Fig. 5 and col. 2, lines 18-30), thus, Ayres inherently discloses the needle is rigid.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUAN V. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-5962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Manahan can be reached on 571-272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T. V. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3731

/Todd E Manahan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731